

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner required election of a single species of the generic invention to which the claims should be restricted if no generic claim is finally held allowable.

Applicants respond as follows.

Applicants elect the species of Figure 8 with traverse. Applicants traverse on the grounds that all of the claims are allowable over the prior art and cover the same basic invention, that of providing each heat transfer conduit with a longitudinally continuous, apertured sleeve-shaped baffle structure. Figures 7 and 8 show different variations on the possible shapes of the baffle structure, while Figures 2A, 3, 4, 5 and 6 show different arrangements of the tubes to which the sleeve shapes of Figure 8 could be applied. Applicants do not elect Figure 1. Additional reasons regarding the patentability of the claims and their genericness are set forth in the Preliminary Amendment that was filed on January 14, 2002.

On these grounds Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the election requirement.

In order to provide a complete response to the Office Action, Applicants identify the following claims as readable on the elected species of Figure 8: Claims 39-58, 60-80 and 82.

Application No. 10/048,129  
Amendment dated September 26, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2003

696-264PCT/US

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any still outstanding matters.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan B. Clement  
Reg. No. 34,563

**MAILING ADDRESS**

HEDMAN & COSTIGAN, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989